UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,963	11/21/2003	Sumio Ashida	008312-0306969	8024
909 7590 05/11/2007 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500			EXAMINER	
			ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J	
MCLEAN, VA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1756	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1/			
	10/717,963	ASHIDA ET AL.	U			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•						
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Martin J. Angebranndt	1756	SS			
Period for Reply	rappears on the sover sheet with	rane derrespondende addres	,5			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATED IN THE STATE OF THIS COMMUNICATED IN THE STATE OF THE S	ATION.  Jly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this commu  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	16 February 2007.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		·				
4) Claim(s) 1 and 5-21 is/are pending in the	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-21</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 5-8</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		v the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing(s	) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. & :	119(a)-(d) or (f)				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	olg. Priority and of oldior.					
1. Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received.	·				
2. Certified copies of the priority docur		plication No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been r	eceived in this National Stag	ge			
application from the International Bu	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not re	eceived.				
Attachment(s)	•					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>	4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) 'Mail Date				
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>		ormal Patent Application				

Application/Control Number: 10/717,963 Page 2

Art Unit: 1756

1. The response of the applicant has been read and given careful consideration. The applicant has perfected priority through the certified translations provided. The rejections below are withdrawn based upon the arguments, the perfection or priority and the amendments to the claims. The terminal disclaimer of 2/16/07 has been accepted and obviates the rejection of the previous office action.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1 and 5-8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application No. 11/235666 (US 2006/0146687). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because these claims include Hafnium oxide in the interfacial layer.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/717,963 Page 3

Art Unit: 1756

4. Claims 1 and 5-8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of patent 7,214,416. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because these claims include Hafnium oxide in the interfacial layer.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin J. Angebranndt whose telephone number is 571-272-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-919// (toll-free).

Martin Angebranndt Primary Examiner

Art Wnit 1756

5/8/01 <del>11/14/2006</del>